

NAVAL ESTABLISHMENT.  
NAVY OF THE UNITED STATES.

|       |                       |   |
|-------|-----------------------|---|
| I.    | 1. United States,     | } 44 Guns.  |
|       | 2. Constitution,      |   |
|       | 3. President,         |   |
|       | 4. Chesapeake,        |   |
|       | 5. Philadelphia,      |   |
| II.   | 1. Constellation,     | } 86 Guns.  |
|       | 2. Congress,          |   |
|       | 3. New-York,          |   |
|       | 4. Infurgent,         |   |
|       | 5. Essex,             |   |
| III.  | 1. Boston,            | } 32 Guns.  |
|       | 2. Essex,             |   |
| IV.   | 1. George Washington, | } 24 guns on main deck,<br>and 8 on quarter-deck. |
|       | 2. General Green,     |   |
|       | 3. Adams,             |   |
|       | 4. John Adams,        |   |
|       | 5. Merrimack,         |   |
| V.    | 1. Ganget,            | } of 20 and under 30 Guns                         |
|       | 2. Connecticut,       |   |
|       | 3. Maryland,          |   |
|       | 4. Portsmouth,        |   |
|       | 5. Merrimack,         |   |
|       | 6. Petropoff,         |   |
|       | 7. Delaware,          |   |
|       | 8. Baltimore,         |   |
| VI.   | 1. Herald,            | } 18 Guns.  |
|       | 2. Trumbull,          |   |
|       | 3. Warren,            |   |
| VII.  | 1. Richmond,          | } 16 Guns.  |
|       | 2. Augusta,           |   |
| VIII. | 1. Eagle,             | } 12 to 14 Guns.                                  |
|       | 2. Pickering,         |   |
|       | 3. Scammel,           |   |
|       | 4. Experiment,        |   |
|       | 5. Enterprise,        |   |
| IX.   | 7 Gallies.            |   |

RECAPITULATION.

|       |   |
|-------|---|
| I.    | 5 Frigates of 44 guns.                                |
| II.   | 4 Ditto of 36 ditto.                                  |
| III.  | 2 Ditto of 32 ditto.                                  |
| IV.   | 4 Ships of 24 guns on gun-deck and 8 on quarter-deck. |
| V.    | 6 Ditto of 20 to 24 guns.                             |
| VI.   | 3 Ditto of 18 ditto.                                  |
| VII.  | 2 Ditto of 16 ditto.                                  |
| VIII. | 5 Ditto of 12 ditto.                                  |
|       | 33  |
| IX.   | 7 Gallies.  |
|       | 40  |

The Secretary of the Navy makes the following Estimate of the pay, subsistence and other expenses of the following description of ships of war, viz.

|   | Dollars. |
|---|----------|
| Of 44 guns and 400 men,                                   | 115,945  |
| 36 guns, and 340 men,                                     | 98,347   |
| 32 guns, and 260 men,                                     | 74,999   |
| 24 on gun deck, 8 on quarter deck, and 220 men,           | 66,785   |
| 20 to 26 guns, and 180 men,                               | 57,269   |
| 18 guns, and 140 men,                                     | 45,780   |
| 16 to 18 guns, and 100 men,                               | 35,737   |
| 12 to 14 guns, and 70 men,                                | 24,215   |
| Gally, 28 men,  | 9,200    |
| Marine Corps, consisting of 1143 men, including officers, | 166,903  |
| 5 Frigates of 44 guns,                                    | 579,728  |
| 4 do. 36  | 393,391  |
| 2 do. 32  | 149,959  |
| 4 (smaller) of 32 guns,                                   | 267,053  |
| 8 Ships of 20 to 26 guns,                                 | 438,158  |
| 3 Sloops of war of 18 guns,                               | 137,341  |
| 2 Brigs of 16 to 18 guns,                                 | 71,474   |
| 5 Brigs and schooners of 12 to 14 guns,                   | 121,069  |
| 7 Gallies,  | 64,400   |
| Contingent expenses,                                      | 37,850   |

Total, adding fractional cents above omitted, 2,447,539

The Secretary of the Navy further estimates:

|   |              |
|---|--------------|
| For procuring with six seventy-four gun ships, and for completing Navy Yards, Docks, Wharves, &c. | 300,000      |
| For erecting Marine barracks,   | 20,000       |
| For maintenance of French prisoners,  | 30,000       |
| And to make up the deficiencies of former appropriations for the maintenance of French prisoners, | 45,000       |
|   | 3,042,339 90 |

But the appropriations heretofore made for the different objects relating to the Navy will not be exhausted at the end of the present year, by a sum equal to 700,000 dollars, so that it may not be necessary to appropriate for the year 1801, for all the navy purposes, exclusive of providing timber to be laid up in store for future use, more than,

700,000

Estimate of the Number of Persons composing the Crews of the Navy of the United States.

|                                     |       |
|-------------------------------------|-------|
| 5 Frigates of 44 Guns, and 400 Men, | 2,000 |
| 4 Ditto,                            | 1,360 |
| 2 Ditto,                            | 820   |
| 4 Ditto, smaller,                   | 880   |
| 8 Ships of 20 to 26 180             | 1,440 |
| 3 Sloops of War, 18                 | 340   |
| 2 Brigs,                            | 100   |
| 5 Dis. and schooners, 12 to 14 70   | 450   |
| 7 Gallies                           | 196   |

Total, including Marines, 7,366

CONGRESS  
OF THE UNITED STATES.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

MONDAY, JANUARY 5, 1801.

A Bill making appropriations for the several years and referred to the committee of the whole house on Monday next.

Messrs. Davis, Nott, and Claiborne were excused from serving on the committee appointed to investigate the official conduct of Winthrop Sargent.

Mr. Davis moved that the committee of Ways and Means be directed to enquire into the expediency of appointing agents in Kentucky and the N. W. Territory to pay pensions becoming due.

The House resolved into a committee of the whole, Mr. RUTLEDGE, in the chair on the

JUDICIARY BILL.

The chairman proceeded in reading the paragraphs until he came to the 21st section, which.

Mr. EGGLETON moved to amend, so as to preserve the plan at present existing, which establishes one Court for Virginia, instead of dividing the state into two districts, and having two courts, one to sit at Richmond and the other at Fredericksburg, as proposed by the bill.

On this motion a lengthy debate ensued. Messrs. EGGLETON, Nicholas, Randolph, Jackson and Mason supported, and Messrs. Griswold, Harper, Bayard, H. Lee, and Otis, opposed it.

Those who supported the motion contended that the proposed alteration was unwarranted by any change which had taken place in Virginia; that heretofore most of the business had been done in the federal court from an accumulation of unjustified demands incurred previously to the formation of the federal constitution; that these demands, for the most part, were now fulfilled; that the existing demands are few, and which one court was fully equal to attending to; that the fact was that justice was administered under the present system with the greatest dispatch; and that at the last term the docket was so completely cleared, in a fitting of ten days, that the court, not fatigued with deciding on suits which had gone through the usual forms, had actually decided several returns to the ending term; that the additional court was not desired by the citizens of Virginia, whose convenience, so far from being furthered, would be injured by it; for that the plan at present one court held at Richmond, and another at Fredericksburg, which were more than twenty miles apart, would place a large portion of the citizens at a greater distance from the seats of the courts, than they are at present from Richmond; which was, besides, the capital of the state, and the place to which the citizens very generally repaired for the transaction of their ordinary affairs—that it behooved those gentlemen who recommended this extension of the judiciary system, to shew the peculiar necessity, and advantages of it.

Those who opposed the motion observed, that it became the government of the United States to organize the judiciary in such a way as to insure an obedience to its laws; and to insure the faithful collection of revenue; that this last object could only be attained by the institution of federal courts, that they were to be established to prevent the convenient attendance of profectors, parties, witnesses, and jurors at the seats of the courts; that the recovery of duties derived from this source could only be made in the Federal courts, and in the places at which infractions of the revenue law took place were very remote, how veridant the patriotism of the citizens, they could not be expected to encounter the great expense and loss of time that would be required in attending a court three or four hundred miles distant; that the most solid objection to an extension of the courts was their expense; that in fact, the extension would probably be an economical arrangement, as the facility of recovering dues to the public would be increased, and with it the productivity of the revenue; and a considerable fund would be saved in the expenses, defrayed by the public, of a grand jury, which from its very nature must be drawn from all the parts of each State; the contracted size of the district from which they were taken; and that the sum which would probably be an equal degree to common jurors, witnesses, and prosecutors, &c. that so far from the statement made

by gentlemen being correct, it was understood that several suits in which the public was interested, had been protracted for several terms; that the little business, alleged to have been brought before the federal court of Virginia, was the mere confidential evidence of the inconveniences attending the present plan, whereby, owing to the remote situation of the greater part of the citizens, they were induced to prefer an appeal to the States; in preference to the federal courts.

It was further declared to be very doubtful on constitutional ground, whether Congress would delegate judicial powers to the State courts; and if it could it was a delicate question how far State judges were amenable to the United States, for a faithful discharge of their duty, inasmuch as they were not subject to the laws of the United States; they were not constitutional subjects of impeachment by Congress; that, at any rate, the effect might be the execution of the laws; from which an appeal to the State government would be the more fatal as it affected the vital principle of the administration of justice; that it was not doubted but that Virginia would be well satisfied with one court in preference to two, or an act of what ever in preference to one; that it would be wise in Congress to conform as nearly as they could, in confidence with economy, to the ideas adopted by the federal States, as well as the established principles of common law, which brought justice home to the door of every man; that it would therefore be advisable, if the expense were not too great, to divide Virginia, not merely into two but into four or six districts, with a court in each; that it was a lame argument, that because we could not do all that was required, we should do nothing; that as to the idea thrown out, that the convenience the western district of Virginia did not require an additional court, it was entitled to no weight; as additional court would not be instituted merely for the convenience of Virginia, but for rendering justice to foreigners and the citizens of other States; and to insure the dignity and independence of the government.

It was further observed that if the division of Virginia, contemplated by the bill, was inconvenient, it might be attended to, though it was believed that the objection arose from a want of geographical knowledge in the gentlemen who made it.

In reply to the same remark, it was said by a member, who represented the western district of Virginia, that there had been but one suit carried before the federal court from his part of the State for ten years, and that at present there was not a single one depending.

Other gentlemen observed that it behoved those who avowed that this additional court was not intended to answer the convenience of the citizens of Virginia, to answer that, notwithstanding the contrary declarations of some gentlemen, who on this occasion, had betrayed the same ignorance of the physical facts of the country, that on previous occasions they had manifested of its moral and political state, the new arrangement would increase, instead of diminish the existing inconveniences, inasmuch as the citizens of the counties of Essex, Caroline, Louisa, and Orange would be removed to a greater distance from Fredericksburg, the center placed seat of their court, than they now were from Richmond.

It was further contended that the State courts were fully competent to discharge all the duties assigned them; and that in Virginia the federal laws had been either invariably obeyed, or enforced; that a spirit of hostility to the federal government had appeared, and that it would be time enough to guard against it when it should appear; that from the remarks of some gentlemen it was apparent, as if they wanted an additional judge, and knew not where to locate him.

The question was then taken on Mr. EGGLETON'S motion to strike out, and left—Ayes 29—Noes 16.

A motion was then made that the committee rise—Left—Ayes 36—Noes 36.

Mr. H. Lee moved to amend the section, so as to produce a division of Virginia into three districts, and to make Staunton instead of Fredericksburg, the Seat of Justice.

Carried, Ayes 45.

—Ayes 29—Noes 16.

The committee of privilege made a report on the letter of the Sergeant at Arms; the preamble of which approves the conduct of the Sergeant; Rates the individuals who made the disturbance in the gallery to have been intoxicated, and to have obstructed; and the wa jurate, who issued the warrant on which a

—Ayes 29—Noes 16.

—Ayes 29—Noes 16.